

CALNET II RFP DGS-2053

Question and Answer Set #26

April 18, 2006

159. There is a requirement for CALSTARS under Invoicing that is marked as a Desirable (D), but the points associated with the requirement make up a large percentage of the total points for the Invoice Section.

Module	Total	Invoice	Calstars %
1	1100	250	23%
2	1600	250	16%
3	720	210	29%
4	2130	535	25%

Was it the State's intent to apply such a large weighted factor to a "Desirable" Requirement?

Yes, because this Service is an important requirement.

160. After reviewing Exhibit 7B Cost Table 6.2.5, 900 Services, the rate elements and units of measure seem to be inconsistent with the rate elements and units of measure currently used in the current CALNET contract which are more typical rate elements and units of measure in the industry.

The Section 7 cost table was modified in Addendum 28.

161. We need further description by the State on these types of fraud from 6.1.8.2 to be able to discuss our solution:

- Booked Calls from Call Office
- Stolen Line
- Call Back Operators
- Excessive Short Inbound Call Duration Calls?

These types of fraud are part of a list of example of fraud which the State considers to be within the capability of Bidders to preclude from occurring. In the event that the Bidder believes that one or more of these examples of fraudulent

call activity do not apply to a specific module, then the Bidder should provide an appropriate explanation. Under the RFP category of “Requirement for Fraud Services Management Services”, The State has requested that the Bidder identify the categories of fraudulent activity that are consistent with industry experience and practice. The State’s primary concern here is to ensure that the Bidder has a plan and methodology for identifying fraudulent activity and providing customer education and training programs to reduce fraudulent activity.

162. Circuit Number(s) / service ID / phone number are listed as one item in reports 6.1.13.8.1, 6.1.13.8.2 and 6.1.13.8.3. Are these the same fields as Circuit ID, Billing Telephone Number and Service type used in other reports?

Yes, these are the same fields as Circuit ID, Billing Telephone Number and Service type used in other reports.

163. Circuit/phone number quantity in report 6.1.12.2.7 is that the same as Circuit ID and Billing Telephone number used in other reports?

Yes, this is the same as Circuit ID and Billing Telephone number used in other reports.

164. On report 6.1.12.2.5, there is a field for billing telephone number and a separate field for Telephone number, are they the same? If not what is meant by telephone number?

Language was revised in Addendum 28 to clarify this. Bill payer number is being used as the master billing number for a consolidated invoice. Within the consolidated invoice, all of the customers’ circuit numbers or telephone numbers would be listed. Billing telephone number is used for an individual invoice. Therefore, the billing telephone number is the same as the customer’s phone number for a voice invoice. For a data invoice, the billing telephone number is usually different from the actual data circuit ID.

165. Is Customer Address in 6.1.12.2.1, 6.1.12.2.3, 6.1.12.2.4 the same thing as Billing Address or Service location used in other reports?

Customer Address and Billing Address are considered the same. Service location is the actual physical location of the service, which is not always the same as the customer/billing address.

166. Is Report period in 6.1.13.8.1, 6.1.13.8.2 and 6.1.13.8.3 the same as Date field in 6.1.12.2.2, 6.1.12.2.3 and 6.1.12.2.7? If not, what does Date field mean?

Yes, "Report Period" in 6.1.13.8.1, 6.1.13.8.2 and 6.1.13.8.3 means the same as "Date" in 6.1.12.2.2, 6.1.12.2.3 and 6.1.12.2.7. Addendum 28 revised "Date" in 6.1.12.2.2, 6.1.12.2.3 and 6.1.12.2.7 to read "Report Period".

167. Is Service address in 6.1.12.2.1, 6.1.12.2.3 and 6.1.13.8.1 the same as Service Location in 6.1.12.2.5 and 6.1.12.2.7, with Service Location address asking for additional fields?

Addendum 28 addressed these inconsistencies. Service Address is being used in all of the identified sections listed. All will require the additional fields.

168. Please explain the difference between Date/Time occurrence for report 6.1.13.8.3 and Date/Time, trouble ticket opened also on 6.1.13.8.3.

“Date/Time of occurrence” refers to the date and start time of the occurrence itself. “Date/Time of trouble ticket” refers to the date and time when the trouble ticket is opened by a customer or by the contractor. These dates and times may vary.

169. Various reports call for Product type while others require Service type or Service ID. In conjunction with this question, different reports call for Service feature type, features affected and features associated to each service. An example of our understanding of these fields would be the Product/Service type would be a general group such as Business Access lines, and a possible feature type associated to the service would be Message Waiting. The product type would have a code and description and the feature would have a separate code and description, is that correct?

Your understanding is correct.

170. Please confirm that the Customer's Service order number on report 6.1.13.8.2 and STD 20 number or Agency order number on report 6.1.12.2.5 are the same thing.

Yes they are the same. Both sections were revised in Addendum 28 to read: "STD. 20 or Purchase Order Number".

171. What is the difference between Outage type and SLA type on report 6.1.12.2.4? Can you provide an example?

Outage type is the cause of the outage (cable cut, bad card within a router, etc.). SLA type (availability, excessive, TTR, CAT 1, 2 or 3, etc.) is the type of SLA that will be rebated to the customer.

172. Question 117 is repeated herewith in order for the State to provide a more comprehensive response, as promised in the State's response to the original question 117. Question 117 follows:

"We understand that DTS's intent is to list identifiable and measurable "tools" and "reports" in the SLA tables in Sections 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4. However, upon further review, the SLA tables list entire Sections of the RFP that include ad-hoc, query, and on-line reports as well as numerous general references to reports and tools. We believe this to be too open ended to provide a clear, concise SLA response.

Because many of the tools and reports are listed in two or three of the tables, a tool that creates multiple reports could become unavailable and SLA's would apply to the tool and every report the tool is capable of creating.

Examples from Module 2 include Table 6.2.22.3.3, Report Delivery Intervals, Table 6.2.22.3.4, Tools and Implementation, Table 6.2.22.3.5, Tool Availability, etc. These examples are fundamentally the same in all four Modules.

Would DTS create a specific list of tools and reports that pertain to each of the SLA tables?"

The State is unable to respond to the Bidder's request for "specific tools and reports that pertain to each SLA table" other than what has been identified in the RFP because the question lacks sufficient specificity. The State has identified tools and reports in Section 6, Administrative Service Level Agreement, and various aspects of Administrative Requirements. This includes reporting Requirements.

Beyond that, the State cannot respond to the Bidder's request for "specific tools and reports that pertain to each table" with having first reviewed the Bidder's proposal, in which the Bidder has identified specific tools and the Bidder's planned application of those tools in support of RFP Requirements.

In general terms, it may be beneficial to discuss the tables that define Administrative Service Level Agreement Requirements to assist the Bidder in understanding the purpose of the Requirements. First, to reduce confusion, the column titled "Services" is incorrectly labeled; it should be titled "Administrative Tools, Reports and Applications." This was corrected in Addendum 27.

Each table should be viewed in the context of the Module in which it appears, and each identifies:

Administrative Tools, Reports and Applications – The purpose of this column is to list all applicable tools, reports, and applications appropriate to the defined task. To assist the Bidder, the State has provided the applicable RFP reference where the tool, report, or application requirement is established and identified. It is intended for reference purposes only.

SLA Name – This column identifies the activity, provides a definition of the activity, a measurement process, objectives, and rights and remedies.

The Bidder stated that many tools and reports are listed on "two or three" tables. One example mentioned in the question is "Report Delivery Intervals". If we apply the previous general discussion, then the "Report Delivery Intervals" table identifies the activity, in this case, "Report Delivery Intervals," the impacted reports, and the appropriate RFP reference; it also provides the definition of each report, as well as the measurement process, objectives, and rights and remedies associated with each impacted report.

Cross references in multiple sections in the RFP Requirements are not intended to increase demands on the Bidder. The Bidder's concern about the multiple mention of the capability for "ad-hoc reports, query, and on-line reports" may be an illustration of this point. The Bidder is advised to request clarification of specific instances where the Bidder feels that an undue demand is being imposed. The State will clarify any issues where the Bidder provides very specific concerns.

173. Question 135 is repeated herewith in order for the State to provide a more comprehensive response, as promised in the State's response to the original question 135. Question 135 follows:

"In Reference 6.2.22.3 Administrative Service Level Agreements: 1) Will the state consider modifying the compounding penalties? For example, if we miss 6.2.22.3.5 Tool Availability because the private website is down, we will also miss the 6.2.22.3.3 Report Delivery Intervals because these are required to be available via the private

website. This results in a double jeopardy penalty. We suggest a similar strategy used for the technical SLA penalties. For example a Category 3 outage, would also include a Category 2 outage and an Enhanced Service outage, but only the Category 3 penalty would apply. 2) Will the State consider monthly or annual penalty caps?"

In the event a specific tool fails, and that failure prevents the Bidder from meeting Reporting Requirements, the Bidder will not be subject to SLAs in more than one category. For example, if the Bidder fails to meet the requirements for "Report Delivery Intervals" and for "Tool Availability", the Bidder will not be subject to Administrative SLA penalties for both. However, the State reserves that right to select the SLA whose penalty will apply.

174. In Addendum #16 11/21/05 the State made the following change to Section 6.3.4 in Module 3: Section 6.3.4, pages 49-49a: changed total number of end users from 4,000 to 80,000 and changed number of end users for each city area. In addendum #20, for Section 7 the State modified the tables associated with the information in Section 6 as follows:

"Section 7 Exhibits A, B, C and D are being replaced in their entirety with this addendum (see the CALNET II home page for the files). This complete reissue ensures that the Section 7 Excel worksheets conform to the Section 6 cost tables."

The current Model Recurring Monthly Quantities for Converged Services, IP Telephony Business Line Service Features (M-O) (Column I, Line Item #1) in Cost Table 6.3.4.3.a in Exhibit 7-C, Addendum 20 1/13/06, and the Model Recurring Monthly Quantities for Converged Services, IP Telephony Voice Mail Services and Features (M-O) (Column I, Line Item #1) in Cost Table 6.3.4.5a Exhibit 7-C, Addendum 20 do not reflect the State's revised numbers in Section 6.3.4 Addendum #16. Does the State plan to revise these quantities in a future Addendum to reflect the changes in Addendum #16?

Quantities were revised in Addendum 28.

175-178: addressed in QA Set 25.

179. The information required for response in Section 6.2.3 does not correspond to the information required for the price sheets found in Section 7. Will the State be providing updated pricing sheets?

Yes, Section 7 will be modified in a future addendum.

180. In question 175 the State said it would be removing the word "core" from the requirement. Since the language also appears in Section 4.5.10, will the State be removing it from there also?

The State removed the word "core" from Section 4.5.10 in Addendum 28.

181. In Question and Answer Set #24 - April 5, 2006, the State's response to Question 149 said that bidders may not modify but could "re-create" section 7 pricing spreadsheets for additional desirable or unsolicited features or services. How should these "bidder created" pricing spreadsheets be labeled, and where should they be placed in the final bid submission?

Bidders should label these additional pricing sheets with the same number and title as the table in Section 7 to which they relate, except add a parenthetical entry after the title indicating that this table is a Bidder-created table for additional desirable or unsolicited features. These Bidder-created pricing spreadsheets should be attached following the tables in Section 7 to which they relate. Also, in the text of the proposal, Bidders should clearly identify all Bidder-created tables and reference the page number and volume in the final proposal where they are located.

182. The State has said that they expect SLAs to be offered with any desirable or unsolicited feature or service offered. How should these SLA tables be labeled and where should they be placed in the final bid submission?

Bidders should include SLAs for any desirable or unsolicited features or service in the SLA section of their proposal. Such additional SLAs should be clearly marked as pertaining to specific additional desirable or unsolicited features. Also, in the text of the proposal, Bidders should clearly identify all such SLAs and reference the page number and volume in the final proposal where they are located.

183. In section 9 for Module 2, Section 6.2.24.6 is identified as Network Backbone Monitoring and has points assigned. In the RFP, section 6.2.24.6 is Contracted Service Project Work Reports (M). Where do the points assigned to this section belong?

Section 9 is under revision to align addenda changes to Section 6 with the details in the scoring tables in Section 9. It will be released in the near future.

184. In Section 9, Module 4 evaluation points are shown to have the maximum point value of 27,948, but the maximum points add up to 28,148. In addition, Section 9, Module 4 evaluation tables list 6.4.4.2 for 1800 maximum points twice, once at the bottom of page 21 and once on the top of page 22. (Addendum 25). Would STND please clarify both of these discrepancies?

Section 9 is under revision. It will be released in the near future and these discrepancies will be corrected.

185. In section 5.5.2 the State has defined a preliminary list of taxes and surcharges that are considered to be appropriate for inclusion on the Contractor's CALNET II invoices (for Modules 1 and 2) , the State further goes on to say that "to the State's knowledge, the Fees identified below are not applicable to RFP Modules 6.3 and 6.4". Since there may be access services and hence other potential applicable taxes and surcharges associated with Module 3 and Module 4, how should the Vendor proceed?

Bidders should comply with Section 5.5 Regulatory Services, Fees, Taxes, and Surcharges that directs Bidders to include in their response (Exhibit 5A) those taxes and surcharges they plan to include on invoices. The State reserves the right to challenge or validate these taxes and surcharges in accordance with Appendix B, Model Contract Language, Section 60.